

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, claims 1-5 were pending in the application, of which claim 1 is independent. In the Office Action dated November 4, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,652 (Matsushima) and rejected claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Matsushima. Following this response, claims 1-5 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's objections and rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

In the Office Action dated November 4, 2004, the Examiner ejected claims 1-5 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to more clearly recite the subject matter of the invention. Specifically and as suggested by the Examiner, Applicant amends claim 1 to add the phrase "wherein all of said foundation warp used for said tape main portion, said warps used for said element-mounting edge portion and said core string comprise a polyester base resin." Applicant notes that the amendment is supported by the specification (e.g., page 11, line 23 and page 12, lines 7 and 15) and adds no new matter. In light of this amendment to claim 1 and as claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 2 as being either anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Matsushima or obvious under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) in view of Matsushima. As noted above, Applicant amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner so as to recite "wherein all of said foundation warp used for said tap main portion, said warps used for said element-mounting edge portion and said core string comprise a polyester-based resin." Indeed, Matsushima fails to disclose, teach or suggest as set forth in amended claim 1 or claim 2 (at least in part due to the dependence of claim 2 upon claim 1). Therefore, Matsushima does not anticipate amended claim 1 nor does Matsushima render amended claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 3-5 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 3-5 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Matsushima. With the amendments to claim 1, as suggested by the Examiner, and the fact that claims 3-5 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 3-5 be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 2, 2005

By: 
F. Leslie Bessenger III
Reg. No. 39,108